



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,139	03/19/2001	Bartlett Scott Hudson Michel	D-427A	7587

7590

02/24/2006

Derrick M. Reid
Patent Attorney
The Aerospace Corporation
P. O. Box 92957 (M1/040)
Los Angeles, CA 90009-2957

EXAMINER

TIV, BACKHEAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/812,139	HUDSON MICHEL, BARTLETT SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Backhean Tiv	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/2/06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. This is a response to the amendment/Remarks filed on 12/02/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As per claims 1-17, describes the use of the proximal IPA to process the steps of generating, indicating, and originating. However, the specification does not describe the proximal IPA doing these steps. The examiner suggests the applicant points to specific portions of the specification to support the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-17, recites the use of "proximal IPA(proximal internet protocol address)", it is unclear how the proximal IPA can generate a URL. IP address are only assigned to computers for use with the Internet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,774,660 issued to Brendel et al.(Brendel) in view of US Patent 6,052,718 issued to Gifford in further view of US Patent 6,304,913 issued to Rune.

As per claim 1, Brendel teaches a method of broadcasting from a proximal cache at a proximal internet protocol address (IPA) a routing item for indicating an originator storing web content data associated with a uniform resource locator (URL) of a web server permanently storing the web content data, the method comprising the steps of, originating URL identifier generating an originating URL identifier for indicating the URL(col.1,lines 37-64), destination IPA generating a destination IPA for indicating a destination cache(col.2,lines 29-35),;

associating the originating IPA and the originating URL as the routing item(col.1, lines 64-col.2, lines 18).

Brendel, however does not teach originating IPA generating an originating IPA for indicating the originator, and transmitting the routing item from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a destination IPA.

Gifford teaches originating IPA generating an originating IPA for indicating the originator(col.9, lines 19-22), and transmitting the routing item from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a destination IPA(col.7, line 60-col.8, line10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brendel to include originating IPA generating an originating IPA for indicating the originator, associating the originating IPA and the originating URL as the routing item, and transmitting the routing item from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a destination IPA as taught by Gifford in order to route request to a server that will perform well for the client(Gifford, col.1, lines 33-40).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel and Gifford in order to route request to a server to better serve the client(Gifford, col.1, lines 33-40).

Brendel in view of Gifford does not explicitly teach a proximal IPA.

Rune teaches the use of the server which is nearest to the host(Abstract; the examiner interprets proximal IPA as the server closest to the host).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Brendel in view of Gifford to explicitly use the server nearest to the host as taught by Rune in order to provide improved response time for selecting a server(Rune, col.1, lines 54-67).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel, Gifford, and Rune in order to provide improved response time for selecting a server(Rune, col.1, lines 54-67).

Claims 2-6,8,9,11,12,14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,774,660 issued to Brendel et al.(Brendel) in view of US Patent 6,052,718 issued to Gifford in further view of US Patent 6,304,913 issued to Rune in further view of US Patent 6,546,422 issued to Isoyama et al.(Isoyama).

Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune teaches all the limitations of claim 1, however does not teach as per claim 2, the method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of,
distance generating a distance metrics for indicating a web
hop distance of a number of the plurality of cooperative web caches
through which the URL web content data would be communicated from
the from the originator through the plurality of cooperative web
caches to the proximal web cache.

Isoyama teaches distance generating a distance metrics for indicating a web hop distance of a number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the URL web content data would be communicated from the from the originator through the plurality of cooperative web caches to the proximal web cache(col.4,lines 52-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune to include teaches distance generating a distance metrics for indicating a web hop distance of a number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the URL web content data would be communicated from the from the originator through the plurality of cooperative web caches to the proximal web cache as taught by Isoyama in order to minimize the use of network resource for caching(Isoyama, col.2,lines 30-31).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel, Runde Gifford, and Isoyama to provide a method to minimize the use of network resources(Isoyama, col.2, lines 30-31).

As per claim 3, the method of claim 2 wherein,
the originating URL identifier is a proximal URL identifier(Brendel, col.1,lines 37-64),
the originating IPA is the proximal IPA(Gifford, col.6,line 66-col.7,line 1)
the proximal cache stores locally the web content data(Brendel, Fig.2), and
the metric distance is one indicating that one web hop is

between the destination cache to the proximal cache(Isoyama, Fig.4). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 2.

As per claim 4, the method of claim 2 wherein,
the originating URL identifier is a source URL identifier(Brendel, col.1,lines 37-64),
the originating IPA is the source IPA indicating an IPA
location of a source distally storing the web content data(Brendel, col.2,lines 29-35),
the metric distance is greater than one indicating a number
greater than one of the number of web hops between the destination
cache through the proximal cache to the source distally storing the
web content data(Isoyama, Fig.4). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 2.

As per claim 5, the method of claim 4 wherein, the source is a distal web cache
distal storing the web content data, and the source IPA is a distal web cache
IPA(Brendel, col.2,lines 29-35).

As per claim 6, the method of claim 4 wherein, the source is the web server
distal permanently storing the web content data(Brendel, col.2,lines 36-39), and
the source IPA is a web server IPA indicating the IPA location of the web
server(Brendel, col.2,lines 29-40).

As per claim 8, Brendel teaches a method of broadcasting from a proximal cache
at a proximal internet protocol address (IPA) a routing item for indicating a
distal web cache storing web content data associated with a uniform
resource locator (URL) of a web server permanently storing the web
content data, the proximal web cache is a first one of a plurality

of cooperative web caches, the distal web caches is a last one of the plurality of cooperative web caches, the method comprising the steps of,

URL identifier generating a URL identifier for indicating the web content data of the URL stored in the distal web cache(Brendel, Figs.1-3),
proximal IPA generating the proximal IPA for indicating the location of the proximal cache(Brendel, col.2,lines1-9),
destination IPA generating a destination IPA for indicating a destination cache(Brendel, Figs.1-3,element 18),

However, Brendel does not teach transmitting the routing item from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a destination IPA and distance generating a distance metric for indicating a web hop distance of any number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the web content data would be communicated from the distal web cache to the destination web cache, associating the proximal IPA and the URL identifier and the distance metric as the routing item.

Gifford teaches transmitting the routing item from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a destination IPA(Gifford, col.7,line 60-col.8,line10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brendel to include transmitting the routing item from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a

destination IPA as taught by Gifford in order to route request to a server that will perform well for the client(Gifford, col.1,lines 33-40).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel and Gifford in order to route request to a server to better serve the client(Gifford, col.1, lines 33-40).

Brendel in view of Gifford does not explicitly teach a proximal IPA.

Rune teaches the use of the server which is nearest to the host(Abstract; the examiner interprets proximal IPA as the server closest to the host).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Brendel in view of Gifford to explicitly use the server nearest to the host as taught by Rune in order to provide improved response time for selecting a server(Rune, col.1, lines 54-67).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel, Gifford, and Rune in order to provide improved response time for selecting a server(Rune, col.1, lines 54-67).

Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune however does not teach distance generating a distance metric for indicating a web hop distance of any number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the web content data would be communicated from the distal web cache to the destination web cache (Isoyama, col.4,lines 52-62), associating the proximal IPA and the URL identifier and the distance metric as the routing item(Isoyama, Fig.4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune to include distance generating a distance metric for indicating a web hop distance of any number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the web content data would be communicated from the distal web cache to the destination web cache as taught by Isoyama in order to minimize the use of network resource for caching(Isoyama, col.2,lines 30-31).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel, Gifford,Rune, and Isoyama to provide a method to minimize the use of network resources(Isoyama, col.2, lines 30-31).

As per claim 9, the method of claim 8 wherein, the distance metric is greater than one indicating a number greater than one of the number of web hops between the destination cache through the proximal cache to the distal web cache storing the web content data(Isoyama, Fig.4). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 8.

As per claim 11, the method of claim 8 further comprising the steps of, repeating the URL identifier generating step(Brendel, col.1,lines 37-64), proximal IPA generating step(Brendel, Fig.2), distance generating step(Isoyama, Fig.4), the associating step (Isoyama, Fig.4); it is implicit to repeat the steps of URL generating, proximal IPA generating, distance generating, and associating because there are multiple items in the cache therefore, these steps are necessary for accessing the multiple items in the cache, a plurality of times for generating a plurality of routing items each comprising a URL identifier and a respective distance metric, and

Art Unit: 2151

incorporating the plurality of routing items within a protocol data structure within the routing packet prior to the transmitting step, the routing protocol packet comprising the URL and a respective distance metrics(Isoyama, Fig.4)and comprising the proximal IPA and the destination IPA(Gifford, col.7,line 60-col.8,line10,Brendel,Fig.7). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 8.

As per claim 12, Brendel teaches a method of broadcasting from a proximal cache at a proximal internet protocol address (IPA) a routing item for indicating a distal web cache storing web content data associated with a uniform resource locator (URL) of a web server permanently storing the web content data, the proximal web cache is a first one of a plurality of cooperative web caches, the distal web caches is a last one of the plurality of cooperative web caches, the method comprising the steps of,

URL identifier generating a URL identifier of the plurality of URL identifiers, the URL identifier for indicating the web content data of the URL stored in the distal web cache(Brendel, Figs.1-3),

proximal IPA generating the proximal IPA for indicating the location of the proximal cache(Brendel, col.2,lines1-9),

destination IPA generating a destination IPA for indicating a destination cache(Brendel, Figs.1-3,element 18),

However does not teach associating the proximal IPA and the URL and the distance metrics as the routing item, and transmitting the routing item in a routing packet within a routing protocol from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a destination IPA, storing in a routing table a plurality of URL identifiers cross referenced a respective plurality of distance metrics, distance generating a distance metrics by cross referencing the URL identifier to one of the plurality of URL identifiers and to a respective one of the plurality of distance metrics for indicating a web hop distance of any number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the web content data would be communicated from the distal web cache to the destination web cache.

Gifford teaches associating the proximal IPA and the URL and the distance metrics as the routing item (Gifford, col.7,lines 51-59), and transmitting the routing item in a routing packet within a routing protocol from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a destination IPA(Gifford, col.7,line 60-col.8,line10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brendel to include associating the proximal IPA and the URL and the distance metrics as the routing item, and transmitting the routing item in a routing packet within a routing protocol from the proximal cache at the proximal IPA to the destination cache at a destination IPA as taught by Gifford in order to route request to a server that will perform well for the client(col.1,lines 33-40).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel and Gifford in order to route request to a server to better serve the client(Gifford, col.1, lines 33-40).

Brendel in view of Gifford does not explicitly teach a proximal IPA.

Rune teaches the use of the server which is nearest to the host(Abstract; the examiner interprets proximal IPA as the server closest to the host).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Brendel in view of Gifford to explicitly use the server nearest to the host as taught by Rune in order to provide improved response time for selecting a server(Rune, col.1, lines 54-67).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel, Gifford, and Rune in order to provide improved response time for selecting a server(Rune, col.1, lines 54-67).

Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune does not teach storing in a routing table a plurality of URL identifiers cross referenced a respective plurality of distance metrics, distance generating a distance metrics by cross referencing the URL identifier to one of the plurality of URL identifiers and to a respective one of the plurality of distance metrics for indicating a web hop distance of any number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the web content data would be communicated from the distal web cache to the destination web cache.

Isoyama teaches storing in a routing table a plurality of URL identifiers cross referenced a respective plurality of distance metrics (Isoyama, col.4,lines 52-62),

distance generating a distance metrics by cross referencing the URL identifier to one of the plurality of URL identifiers and to a respective one of the plurality of distance metrics for indicating a web hop distance of any number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the web content data would be communicated from the distal web cache to the destination web cache(Isoyama, col.4,lines 34-62),

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune to include a routing table a plurality of URL identifiers cross referenced a respective plurality of distance metrics, distance generating a distance metrics by cross referencing the URL identifier to one of the plurality of URL identifiers and to a respective one of the plurality of distance metrics for indicating a web hop distance of any number of the plurality of cooperative web caches through which the web content data would be communicated from the distal web cache to the destination web cache as taught by Isoyama in order to minimize the use of network resource for caching(col.2,lines 30-31).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel, Gifford, Rune, and Isoyama to provide a method to minimize the use of network resources(Isoyama, col.2, lines 30-31).

Claim 14 is of the same scope as claim 11, therefore is rejected based on the same rationale (see claim 11 rejection).

As per claim 15, the method of claim 12 wherein, the storing steps creates a routing table for cross referencing the plurality of URL identifiers to the plurality of

distance metrics (Isoyama, Fig.4) and to one or more juxtaposed cooperative web caches IPAs of one or more juxtaposed cooperative web caches of the cooperative web caches, the one or more juxtaposed cooperative web caches for routing URL identifiers to distal web caches storing the web content data of the respective plurality of URL identifiers(Brendel, Fig.5). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 12.

As per claim 16, the method of claim 15 wherein the proximal cache and the one or more juxtaposed cooperative web caches being within a local group of cooperative web caches(Brendel, Fig.2; the examiner interprets that the servers of Fig.2 is juxtaposed cooperative web caches). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 12

As per claim 17, the method of claim 16 wherein the proximal cache is within one or more local groups of cooperative web caches(Brendel, Fig.2; it is inherent that the proximal cache could be on of the servers). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 12

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,774,660 issued to Brendel et al.(Brendel) in view of US Patent 6,052,718 issued to Gifford US Patent 6,304,913 issued to Rune in further view of US Patent 6,701,415 issued to Hendren, III(Hendren).

Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune teaches all the limitations of claim 1 and an exact URL identifier being an exact URL comprising a plurality of URL

components(Brendel, col.1,lines 37-63), and the originating URL identifier is selected from the group consisting of, a wildcard URL identifier being a wildcard URL comprising a plurality of URL components a last URL component of which being a wildcard component(Brendel, col.2, lines 19-28) however does not teach as per claim 7, the method of claim 1, wherein a coded URL identifier being a coded URL comprising a series of hashing codes of a decomposed URL being a decomposition of the URL selected from the group consisting of either an exact URL or a wildcard URL each of which comprising a series of URL components, the series of hashing codes being a sequence of hashing codes of respective URL segments of a respective series of increasingly concatenated URL components of the series of URL components of the URL.

Hendren teaches a coded URL identifier being a coded URL comprising a series of hashing codes of a decomposed URL being a decomposition of the URL selected from the group consisting of either an exact URL or a wildcard URL each of which comprising a series of URL components, the series of hashing codes being a sequence of hashing codes of respective URL segments of a respective series of increasingly concatenated URL components of the series of URL components of the URL(col.2,lines 37-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune to include a coded URL identifier being a coded URL comprising a series of hashing codes of a decomposed URL being a decomposition of the URL selected

from the group consisting of either an exact URL or a wildcard URL each of which comprising a series of URL components, the series of hashing codes being a sequence of hashing codes of respective URL segments of a respective series of increasingly concatenated URL components of the series of URL components of the URL as taught by Hendren in order to select one of a plurality of caches(Hendren, col.3, lines 17-22).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel, Gifford, Rune, and Hendren to provide a method to select a desired caches from a plurality of caches(Hendren, col.3, lines 17-22).

Claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,774,660 issued to Brendel et al.(Brendel) in view of US Patent 6,052,718 issued to Gifford in further view of US Patent 6,304,913 issued to Rune in further view of US Patent 6,546,422 issued to Isoyama et al.(Isoyama) in further view of US Patent 6,701,415 issued to Hendren, III(Hendren).

Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune in further view of Isoyama teaches all the limitations of claim 8,12 and an exact URL identifier being an exact URL comprising a plurality of URL components(Brendel, col.1,lines 37-63), and the originating URL identifier is selected from the group consisting of, a wildcard URL identifier being a wildcard URL comprising a plurality of URL components a last URL component of which being a wildcard component(Brendel, col.2, lines 19-28) however

does not teach as per claim 10 and 13, wherein a coded URL identifier being a coded URL comprising a series of hashing codes of a decomposed URL being a decomposition of the URL selected from the group consisting of either an exact URL or a wildcard URL each of which comprising a series of URL components, the series of hashing codes being a sequence of hashing codes of respective URL segments of a respective series of increasingly concatenated URL components of the series of URL components of the URL.

Hendren teaches a coded URL identifier being a coded URL comprising a series of hashing codes of a decomposed URL being a decomposition of the URL selected from the group consisting of either an exact URL or a wildcard URL each of which comprising a series of URL components, the series of hashing codes being a sequence of hashing codes of respective URL segments of a respective series of increasingly concatenated URL components of the series of URL components of the URL (col.2, lines 37-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brendel in view of Gifford in further view of Rune in further view of Isoyama to include a coded URL identifier being a coded URL comprising a series of hashing codes of a decomposed URL being a decomposition of the URL selected from the group consisting of either an exact URL or a wildcard URL each of which comprising a series of URL components, the series of hashing codes being a sequence of hashing codes of respective URL segments of a respective series of increasingly concatenated URL components of the series of URL

components of the URL as taught by Hendren in order to select one of a plurality of caches(Hendren, col.3, lines 17-22).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brendel, Gifford,Rune, Isoyama and Hendren to provide a method to select a desired caches from a plurality of caches(Hendren, col.3, lines 17-22).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

US Patent 5,983,227 issued to Nazem et al., Abstract

US Patent 6,154,738 issued to Call, Abstract

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2151

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571)272-3941. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 A.M.-12 P.M. and 1 -6 P.M. Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Backhean Tiv
2151
2/15/06



ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER